

/387 cont./

372 openings in the top prevented it from escaping easily. The entire
342 structure was well insulated, for it was meant to offer special protection against the rigors of the climate. Since it was built in the damp western part where dry firewood was not available in large quantities, the Indians managed by constantly carrying green wood into the hut and piling it up. In a few days it was dry and only then was used for burning. Even a supply of tussock grass [51] (*Poa flabellata*) was kept on hand, for this litter for the bed had to be renewed at least every two weeks.

25/ The men supplied the necessary food for their families on communal hunting expeditions which were usually so successful that a good share of the booty could be stored away for a few days. This helped in periods when the hunt was seriously hindered by continuous stormy weather. They were anxiously concerned about having an abundant supply of meat always on hand, if not perhaps a whale /388/ lying on the shore. Otherwise the gathering of many people in the same place in a securely built hut would not only be pointless, but even dangerous. Inevitably the inhabitants frightened the game farther and farther away from the dwelling, which made hunting increasingly difficult. Then only ample stores kept off the threatening specter of hunger.

342 A hut for several families was occupied only in winter.
362 Wanderlust was too strong to detain a family in one spot any
22/ length of time for other reasons. The people who built a communal hut would perhaps come back to it for a second winter, but not after that, for the game supply had been exhausted over a wide area, and they themselves were kept away by the boredom of sitting still. The arrangement described here might be referred to as the "winter hut." Near it a sort of winter supply was piled up. The very safe shelter provided somewhat comfortable living [57] conditions, and during the long periods of inactivity together, favorite myths and legends were repeated, or the people told each other stories of their own experiences and Hámmu's stories. Communal huts were not built in the east, and the reason is simple: weather and hunting conditions were much more favorable there.

342 After a few families have settled in the so-called multiple-
593 family hut, they not infrequently erect another building directly beside it for the half-grown children, and this is appropriately known as the "children's hut." It resembles the first hut in shape

/388 cont./

342 and finish, but is smaller. This separate hut for the children is
 • 593 usually built because of lack of space in the large hut, and it is
 855 always regarded as a necessary expedient, for parents do not like to be separated from their children unless it is absolutely necessary. Although the children stay by themselves several hours of the day and all night, they nevertheless like to be with their family a great deal, and they always have access to the large hut. An older woman takes charge of the small company and sometimes brings them a little food, but more often the children get their food from their own parents.

In exceptional cases, for instance, the illness of an older person, imminent confinement of the mother, and so forth, even the single family builds a separate hut for the children beside the one for the adults, much as they dislike to do so. This children's hut is an expedient, and the parents by no means decide on it because they do not wish to be disturbed by crying and noise, for Indian children as such are gentle and quiet.

342 Finally, if several families camp a few days in the same
 857 spot, the children as a game build a little hut with their own hands beside the dwellings of their parents. After all, they must occasionally give vent to their energies. The understanding parents willingly support them in this, sometimes bringing the children meat and approvingly watching the happy gathering. This children's hut is called ëkëli. /389/ It is obvious and understandable that it cannot be an actual dwelling, but serves merely for the enjoyment and playful occupation of the little band (44).

44. This unequivocal appraisal of the so-called children's hut is absent in what Hyades (q):342 and Bridges (a):183 write about it. The latter is more ambiguous than the former.

342 If one stands in front of an Indian hut as a European judge,
 511 no matter which type of hut it is, one involuntarily asks himself: What protection does this poor makeshift afford? By nature our natives are extremely undemanding. If one would like definite proof of this, he need only observe them in their dwelling. If they have a little protection from the heaviest rainfall and the densest snowstorm, against the bitterest cold and the most

/538 cont. /

462 She could not avoid this obligation of ancient custom without serious disadvantage to her family. This brings her into definite contrast with the Selk'nam woman (Vol. I, 288). No matter how faithfully and abundantly the man provides his family with meat from the indigenous animals hunted, the woman, through her special gathering activities, must give her family all those products of nature to which her husband and children are entitled by rights of custom. Under no pretext could a woman consciously avoid this duty. If she were generally lazy in this pursuit or even [558] occasionally negligent, she could expect to be severely criticized by her own husband and held in serious contempt by the whole neighborhood.

462
593 Precisely because there must be a woman in the economic activity of the individual family, husband and children are absolutely dependent upon her. This relationship alone explains the favorable and influential position that she enjoys in her family circle. How much she actually accomplishes /539/ and to what extent she is able, by herself, to keep her family alive become evident when her husband is sick or when she is widowed. Then the entire responsibility of food-seeking rests on her shoulders alone, and she nevertheless provides so well that no one suffers deprivation.

462 Fortunately, in her activity as food-gatherer she has access not only to an abundant supply of one kind, but even to a not inconsiderable choice. She comes home with this and that, bringing a welcome variety into the monotonous meat diet. She can, of course, take from nature only what the latter voluntarily produces and as it is offered, for the harsh climate near the dreaded Cape Horn permits neither agriculture nor animal husbandry (263). The woman herself has invented or learned to make

263. An older account (VSA:XII, 81; 1866) says briefly that the natives "do not till the ground, and have no cattle, nor horses, nor sheep, nor goats in their country" /cited in English/. The experiences of the Mission Scientifique, which Hyades (g):6 describes (p. 32 /untranslated/), show that gardening does not pay there.

/644 cont./

584 It has also happened, as Sara recalled, that the two lovers
 593 decided to elope, that they renounced any kind of marriage celebration, and that they remained away from their parents until they no longer feared reproach. Even if a child should be subjected to threats, he would find sufficient support from close relatives against the inadmissible interference of parents, if only he does not become intimidated and stands his ground. It is the special duty of the uncle to help so that every young person who wishes to marry is permitted to make an absolutely free decision. In case the uncle's influence on the parents does not bring results, [604] he can even influence public opinion against them if they restrict their child's freedom of choice. All opposition dissolves [626] automatically when the young couple has a child to be cared for. [583] Thus, a person who must fear the disapproval or resistance of parents toward a marriage elopes with his partner; once the couple is blessed with one or two children, no one can interfere or separate them.

587 /645/ A woman who becomes a man's second wife also has unrestricted freedom of choice. If she is a widow, she must sometimes be glad if a man will take her, whether she likes him or not, and she suppresses her own wishes without a murmur. Her position is more favorable if an older man, whose wife has perhaps become incapable of working, woos her. From the start she can then secure for herself certain rights and a favorable position in the family. In the great majority of polygamous marriages the two 595 women are sisters (21); the second one to be taken by the man is

21. This custom may be verified in Bridges' (i):21 words: "When a man married more wives than one they were generally sisters, which fact tendered greatly to strengthen the family party" /cited in English/. Relationship by marriage as such does not constitute blood relationship, hence does not hinder marriage (p. 417).

thus frequently better situated in many respects than in a monogamous marriage.

/661 cont./

606 and lances for lance-shafts. In short, they help their parents-in-law in every way and outwardly show them far more veneration than their own parents. A son-in-law would neither demand anything of them nor borrow anything. More than that, the son-in-law and daughter-in-law must also display a certain reserve toward the brothers and sisters of their parents-in-law, although it is not inadmissible to exchange brief words with them occasionally. Every man, however, can associate freely with the grandparents of his wife (43).

43. In the relationship between parents-in-law and children-in-law there are remarkable similarities between the Yamana and the neighboring Selk'nam (Vol. I, 332) and the Halakwulup (Vol. III).

177
182 European civilization, disrupting everything, has done away with many regulations formerly respected by the Yamana as sacred laws. For this reason, disgraceful disorders have met no opposition among the remaining survivors of the tribe. Older Indians whose principles are the same as those of their ancestors and who are helpless to stop this confusion complain bitterly and deeply regret the uncontrollable decline of their entire nation.

b. Married Life

591
593 With the marriage ceremony, independent life begins for the newly wedded couple. They are no longer dependent upon their own parents, and as a newly established conjugal union, they find themselves standing on their own feet. There is no definite rule about the time when the newlyweds break away from their parents. It depends on the position of the family of the bridegroom or of the bride. In exceptional cases, the young people remain with their elders until they have their first child.

The young man does not find it difficult to turn his back on the parental hut; he has long felt the urge for personal /662/ independence and the desire for the unimpeded development of

/662 cont./

591

593

[514]

his abilities. The young bride feels differently. Although she has long been accustomed to all the work that now falls upon her, she at first neither feels nor understands the actual meaning and lifework of her marital state. Sometimes she is overcome by an irresistible feeling of loneliness which depresses her and makes her silent and sad. A young woman may tearfully long for her mother and her sisters. No wonder, then, that the newly married couple will visit the family of the young wife at brief intervals, where she will be comforted and encouraged by her own mother. Each time, the old woman paints her daughter's face with delicate lines, so that her husband will love her more day by day. When finally the greatly desired first child arrives, this situation at once changes very much for the better, for now the young woman is occupied day and night, her activity is the happiest one for a woman, and in her arms she finally holds the symbolic expression of her husband's love.

It is sometimes a considerable sacrifice for the parents to have to part with their daughter, especially if they are old and are completely alone when their last child is taken from them. Their only hope is the prospect that the young couple will remain with them for a time or visit them often and that the son-in-law will perform all kinds of services for them. It is very different with the parents of the boy, who are happy that he is finally going to establish his own household with the girl of his choice (44).

44. Hyades (q):378 exaggerates the duration of this living together: "Usually the young husbands... live for a long time with the parents of their wives, to whom they render many services" /translated from French/.

They wish him all kinds of happiness and follow with interest the development of the new family, without interfering. The parents of both parties are well aware that henceforth it is no longer proper for them to bother their child too often and on account of trifles. Oddly enough, the paternal uncle, indáruwa, and the maternal aunt, yēxadībi (BD:645 writes yekadībi), have the privilege of instructing and admonishing the husband or the wife to an extent far exceeding the few concessions that ancient

604

/662 cont./

604 custom grants the real parents. If the young woman should have the misfortune of having to seek help against infractions or cruel treatment by her husband, she first turns to her blood brother and then to her uncle.

581 In principle, the couple are united in marriage for life.
593 Their marriage is not only a union of hearts, but also a union of work for the welfare of themselves and their children. Each of the two partners is assigned particular duties by ancient custom; it alone decides if and when the dissolution of a marriage is permissible. Unfortunately, the modern age has also changed the original /663/ form of marriage in families of today, so that it is only partly recognizable in its outward appearance; hence the information given by all the old people was particularly valuable to me.

1. Monogamy

114 In describing the marital arrangements and family customs
595 of the Yamana, the critic is faced with a difficult problem. The reports of earlier observers are often quite inadequate and in part clearly colored. In particular, the statements Bridges made about our Indians are consistently unfavorable to them, and his conscious or unconscious intention to show them in an unfriendly light can probably not be denied. The older reports from his pen are in a disparaging and disdainful vein. Later he had enough feeling for justice to correct some of his grossest errors. Other travelers, however, in describing things which they did not directly understand, leaned on Bridges, and this was especially true in the case of arrangements dealing with marriage and the family. This is why there is so much agreement and similarity of opinion among the writers. I personally no longer found the genuine form of married life among the Yamana of earlier times to be a common condition and was obliged to rely on the reports of trustworthy people, such as old Alfredo, during my second visit to Tierra del Fuego. Since their opinions were well founded, they at any rate counteract many false, unsubstantiated contentions.

Many of the earlier travelers maintain that the Yamana condone polygamy, but one cannot clearly tell from their words whether

/680 cont./

462 expenditure of energy, which is then followed by the required
461 period of rest. From the start, neither of the two partners is
given so much work that he finds it oppressive; rather, the type
of activity and the number of tasks which constitute the day's work
of each of them are fully in accord with the natural propensities
which he as a grown man and she as a grown woman bring into
their marriage (71). The co-operation of both of them in their

71. Cooper:169 reviewed the communica-
tions of many travelers on the subject of the
division of labor among the Yamana and con-
cluded from them that "the division seems,
if we take into account Fœrgian tribal condi-
tions and necessities, to be a fairly equitable
one" /cited in English/.

respective spheres of obligations, as well as in their joint under-
takings provides the economic necessities for the family, binds the
two spouses together in mutual dependence, and fills the life of
each of them.

4. Relations between the Spouses

593 In order to supply their sustenance, that is to say, on the
broad basis of household management, the two partners are so
closely bound that one remains dependent on the other. This
alone constitutes a tie that is extraordinarily binding on both
members, but even beyond that they form a union of heart and
soul.

Freedom in the choice of a mate and the important partici-
pation of the wife in economic management make it seem
plausible that in the family both sexes have, so to speak, com-
plete equality of rights and privileges. This fundamental idea is
not invalidated by individual situations or occasional appearances
of a different nature. Even Bridges (n):210 gives eloquent ex-
pression to it: "The wife is not wholly dependent on her husband
and has all the freedom that she wants" /translated from Spanish/.
The woman is well aware of her rights, and that is why she leaves
a man who treats her badly; that is why, without specifically

/680 cont./

593 admonishing him, she expects him to provide for all the needs of the family and why she maintains complete independence in all the labors that are hers by ancient custom, without letting her husband interfere. She gathers mussels or goes fishing, arranges the pelts, and sews clothing whenever the whim strikes her and she is in the mood. If her husband expresses special wishes, he knows as well as she that she is by no means bound to fulfill them and that she does so only out of love and affection.

562
593 This does not alter the fact, however, that Yamana women are ordinarily submissive and yielding. Almost never in words, but certainly in his /681/ attitude, the man, without offending, embodies a considerable preponderance of authority and power. For their part the Indian women, without losing themselves in slavish lack of will power, seem to be more willing to surrender their equality than is customary elsewhere among their sex. It is hard to say whether they are dominated by a sense of weakness or a feeling of inferiority. Outwardly, at any rate, the woman shows a subjection and subordination to her own husband which gives many European observers the impression that she is without rights and merely a weak plaything of her husband's tyranny. This impression is doubtless strengthened by the natural rhythm and extraordinarily silent reserve of all Yamana women in the presence of a man (72). Hence in cases of incompatibility and

[77]
72. This observation may have inspired Hyades (d):308 to say: "The woman submits to her husband, but provided she is faithful, he does not mistreat her" /translated from French/.

quarrels between the two there is never noise or shouting. If he should burst out with a few abusive words, she says nothing.

562
593
152 The excessive submissiveness of most of the women fosters among the men a consciousness of superior power not established by common law. If this is coupled with a nature given to violence and outbursts of rage among one or another of the men, the woman must occasionally expect maltreatment. In his anger, usually caused by minor incidents, he beats her with any stick or scrap of leather he happens to have at hand. She ducks or bends sideways without crying out or weeping. It is all over in a few

/681 cont./

minutes, but for the woman it is accompanied by several hours or an entire night of suppressed pain. The deeply felt mortification pains her incomparably more than the blow or beating.

An irascible and violent husband never has a good reputation, even though at times he might have grounds for dissatisfaction with his wife. None of my informants could remember that a woman had ever suffered serious physical harm from maltreatment. Her relatives would not have let matters go so far, but would have helped her to escape before it happened. Basically, public opinion condemns any physical attack on a woman, and whenever it occurs people take a definite stand against the man or against his wife, depending on the case, in order to prevent a repetition of such quarrels.

In contrast, there is a considerable number of bespecked husbands among the Yamana, according to the statements of the three Lawrence brothers. There is no exaggeration in Bridges' (19)21 words that "not a few men are dominated over by their wives" /cited in English/ (73). Walter is one of these men,

73. Fifteen years later, Bridges (8)210 repeated this sentence without changing it.

helpless in the hands of his wife. Even more, Julia is really a mannish woman, and the not very energetic Alfredo, sometimes at his wife's disposal, lets her have her way. In contrast to these two couples, /682/ Carmen suffers so much from the brutality and violent outbursts of Caldemón that all her fellow-tribesmen pity her and sympathize with her. At present, just as in former times, an individual incident may occur in which the wife burns out and takes violent measures against the man, without however, actually establishing permanent domination. Lovinato (8)144 gives an example: "We have seen a wife justifiably strike her husband, without the other wives present taking her part or they themselves understanding the grave deed" /translated from Italian/. This, too, shows the occasional considerable independence and arbitrariness on the part of the wife toward her husband.

Aside from the above-mentioned disturbances in marital life,

/582 cont./

• 573

Bridges' (8):210 words, "...in general family life is happy and correct" /translated from Spanish/, apply to the relations between the two spouses. They are attached to each other by genuine love. Affection and the desire for love brought them together in marriage, and the things they have done for each other have constantly increased their mutual esteem, so that after a few years they consciously or unconsciously live for one another's happiness (74). They exchange their thoughts and plans; they

74. According to Lovisato's (8):146 unauthoritative opinion, the wife of a Fuegian means no more to him than "a means for having children; we cannot say that she is the equal of the man, not even his slave, although she is given the most painful work" /translated from Italian/. Hyades (9):332, on the other hand, says: "The woman whose conduct is good is independent and respected" /translated from French/. This is the truth!

discuss their own experiences and their observations of their children; they avoid being separated for long and are filled with bitter sorrow if one of them falls sick or dies. From time to time

573
20/

one of them will make the other happy with some surprise or will express the customary, very modest but always effective tenderness. This is limited to a gentle stroking of the cheeks or individual parts of the body, or they lean their head together and move close to each other (75). Everyone is very receptive toward

75. From this account one should correct what Spegazzini (8):166 maintained: "...caresses and kissing are completely unknown among these people" /translated from Spanish/. Parents are certainly not sparing with kisses for their infant (p. 314).

/682 cont./

593 201 demonstrations of love on the part of his spouse (76), the one

76. Hyades (d):308 confirms that "the Fuegians are very capable of feeling love and jealousy" /translated from French/.

more, the other less, according to personal inclination. In this respect Mary seemed to me most conspicuously tender and solicitous of her Robert, whereas not the least reason why old Pedro curtailed all social intercourse with other families was because he wanted to belong only to his very jealous wife (77).

77. Our Fuegians avoid passionate outpourings of emotion. If Lovisato (b):146 had been aware of this, he would never have come to the false conclusion that "conjugal love does not exist" /translated from Italian/.

833 . According to the reliable intimations that I received, the Yamana practice moderation in their sex life and perform the sexual act in /683/ the normal position (78). To maintain that

78. Hyades (q):187 confirms that "among adult Fuegians sexual functions are performed with moderation... The women are as moderate as the men in their demand for sexual pleasure" /translated from French/.

this is the influence of their diet is probably inadequate; there is a greater effect from the constant cool and damp atmosphere than many people suspect. Also it should be noted that the man and wife tire themselves physically almost every day. If they are very weary, they abstain from sexual pleasure and make up for it when they rest for a few days at one place (79).

79. A false statement by Bove (e):158, quoted in footnote 38, is further exaggerated by Lovisato (b):150 in the following

/683 cont. /

833

nonsense: "A man must wash himself after leaving the wigwam of his loves, because otherwise he cannot eat guanaco meat; if he does not wash himself, the dogs die" /translated from Italian/.

● 593

152

Among our Fuegians, far more than elsewhere, conjugal love assumes the form of genuine jealousy. The sharp vigilance with which a husband protected his wife at the approach of a stranger has made many a traveler of earlier times very uncomfortable, and the natives often shunned (80) his bold obtrusiveness by quick

80. This was the most frequent cause for the friction and quarrels accompanying the visit of European ships among our Indians, hence their shy reserve (p. 248 /untranslated/, p. 2).

flight. P. Snow (a):I, 149 clearly speaks of their "jealous disposition" /cited in English/, which they have retained up to the present time, some more, others less (81). It is striking that

81. Several similar opinions have been assembled by Cooper:168.

jealousy generally torments only the men, and that women, with a few exceptions, are spared it. These exceptions apply to wives of the same man. Hyades (q):239 also observed that "the woman, and above all the young woman, is so little aware of this feeling (82) that she seems very happy to see the same favors granted

82. Hyades (q):378 concedes rare exceptions, however, and realizes that "jealous women make life very disagreeable for their husbands" /translated from French/.

her friends by the man she loves" /translated from French/ (83).

83. He also emphatically denies the

/683 cont./

•593
152

false assertion of a few navigators that our Fuegians had handed over their women and girls without resistance.

When there is greater inclination toward jealousy, it is without doubt "the reason for brutalities inflicted by the husband on his wife" /translated from French/. Many men are so susceptible that one cannot be careful enough in his attitude toward their wives, if he wishes to save himself unpleasantness. Outes (g): 55 reports: The men "are very jealous and an inopportune look at his wives is enough to arouse his distrust and to cause the murder of the suspect" /translated from Spanish/. It is true that the jealous husband will occasionally give vent to his rage in serious beatings, but it has never gone as far as murder, according to Fred Lawrence who corrected this report for me. The lot of a woman with a husband so unfortunately predisposed is unpleasant. She must always fear his outbursts of rage, although she herself is blameless and very careful in her conduct.

837 /684/ Is this pronounced jealousy among men caused by their concern over marital fidelity among their wives? This may be true to a certain extent. Certainly, as a rule, the two spouses are faithful, and people without exception esteem this virtue highly. BD:267 gives hingun: "a sober, sensible and faithful wife or woman" /cited in English/. We must agree with Spegazzini (a):166, who emphasizes: "Fidelity is a carefully guarded virtue, whether out of fear of the husband who will repudiate or kill her on account of mere suspicion or because of natural habit /translated from Spanish/ (84). Although fidelity is esteemed in public

84. On July 27, 1872, Bridges (i):18 entered the following in his diary: "Adultery was condemned as a crime and faithfulness extolled as a virtue" /cited in English/.

and everyone tries to avoid accusations of violating it, nevertheless individual violations occasionally did and do occur, and many a married person has secretly transgressed. Bridges' assertion, "there is no fidelity between man and wife" /cited in English/ (VSA:XIII, 203:1866), is false in its generality, and he

/685 cont./

837 to me about her in very unfavorable terms (in this connection see
177 the account on p. 353 /untranslated/).

● 593 Formerly, as we have said, adulterous acts had to be anxious-
837 ly concealed from the eyes of the injured partner. If a man caught
627 his wife, he thrashed her soundly and watched her more closely
after that. If, moreover, he learned the identity of the other
guilty party, he beat him if he was a match for him, or he summoned his own relatives to help (86). In any case he left the

86. Martial:199 describes the punishment of an adulterer which he himself observed in Orange Bay.

vicinity with his undependable wife. Many a man only gradually recovered from his wife's misstep and only after he had repeatedly thrashed her (87). It never went so far as conscious killing;

87. According to Hyades (p):335 and (d):309, "Adultery of the wife is punished by beatings which the husband or her parents inflict on the guilty party and her accomplice" /translated from French/.

there is the possibility, however, that a woman may have succumbed as a result of heavy blows (88). It very seldom happened

593
837
586 88. Martial:199 and also Dabbene (b):189 express themselves in the same vein. It is not correct to speak of actual murder on the part of the husband. The assertion by Outes (g):58 is as false as it is emphatic.

that a man dismissed his faithless wife forever solely because of this offense, even though she may have stayed with her lover for a time and later returned to the hut of her lawful husband (89). If, however, it could be proved that she became

89. Martial:199 tells of an adulteress who

/685 cont. /

593 found her way back to her husband after
837 an absence of three months and was taken
586 in again by him.

pregnant by her lover -- this occurred in the extremely rare case where she was still young and her lawful husband was old -- the husband sent the adulteress irrevocably back to her lover and definitely separated from her.

593 If a wife catches her husband philandering, she usually has
837 no alternative, but to overcome the humiliation silently. A spirited woman will make a noisy scene, scold the sinner, and expose his shameful deed to others, which wounds him more than a beating (90). The relatives of the wife would not dare beat the

90. "The adultery of the husband is not punished, except by the jealous scenes of his wife" /translated from French/.

faithless one; they do no more than to advise her to leave him. Sometimes a very hurt wife has come to blows with her errant husband, if she and another wife in the same hut were both betrayed by their common husband (01).

91. Spegazzini (a):166 reports having seen an Indian "completely paralyzed as a result of a beating which his wives gave him because of this kind of misdeed" /translated from Spanish/.

837 We lack evidence to determine definitely the number of
558 cases of marital infidelity, since every Yamana makes a serious effort /686/ to keep his lapses strictly secret. The fact is, however, according to Gusinde (L):168, that "among the Yamana this shortcoming was more frequent than among the other two Fuegian tribes." There is no doubt, however, that everyone who is known to have erred in this respect experiences perceptible injury to his honor (92).

92. According to Hyades' (q):378 way of

/687 cont. /

431
834 fond of each other and wish to strengthen their affection through such attentions. It is well known that a successful hunter will have his wife give neighboring families large pieces of his booty. She gives the pieces of meat directly to the other women who use it for their respective families.

A man resorts to the same indirect procedure if he wants to avoid any kind of suspicion and yet please some married woman who is devoted to him by giving her a gift. If he knows that she likes to eat some special kinds of fungi, he gladly takes the trouble on his wanderings to gather a few in a leather bag. He goes to the hut of his friend and empties the bag in front of her husband, letting him know by a look or sign: "These fungi are meant chiefly for your wife!" She, too, knows what her taciturn friend particularly likes, and she lets him know her feelings by means of a suitable gift. For example, in order to avoid malicious gossip, she makes blood sausage or blubber sausage, if he is fond of it, and brings it to the wife of her friend with the remark: "I give this sausage to your husband!" He, too, hears her brief words -- as intended -- which tell him everything that her feelings and sentiments have put into the remark. In order to be still less conspicuous, a man will send a small present to his friend through his own wife, and a woman will send hers through her husband. The recipient knows full well what it means. In this way the two friends publicly announce that their relations are harmless, and usually this is the case. A person having an intimate relationship does not wish to call attention to himself and the favored individual, even by means of such admissible demonstrations of love. He will wisely avoid doing so.

This "roundabout giving," as I should like to call it, is by no means regarded as especially strict and exclusive. In case a man meets a single woman somewhere, he may give her a sizable piece of his booty right on the spot, all the more if her dwelling /688/ is far distant from his. The measure just described shows every outsider that our Yamana consider it necessary to fortify conjugal fidelity with external props, so that transgressions do not increase still more.

● 593 In most marriages of our Fuegians, the two partners have had and still have a pleasant, happy, and, after some years, balanced

/688 cont. /

● 593 relationship with one another (96). The far-reaching independence

96. Bridges (e):333 maintains, "in general the conjugal tie was lacking in happiness as well as stability." In saying this he obviously contradicts the facts which are verified by many other details.

of the woman corresponds to her importance in family and household management (97), and her importance in the tribal com-

97. For "a wife was by no means wholly in her husband's power and she had quite as much liberty as was good for her" /cited in English/ (Bridges [I]:21). The far-reaching independence of the woman rests on her important contribution to the support of the family (p. 454).

munity as a whole is very nearly equal to that of the man. Although the various social units (in this case the monogamous marriages) have a very natural basis, there is never an absence of transgressions against their foundations on the part of a few individual persons. Even nowadays on the frosty Cape Horn Archipelago one can meet young married persons who love each other sincerely and aged persons who are harmoniously united.

5. Divorce

586 When young people come together in marriage, they almost never have the definite intention of forming a lifelong union. Calderon told me: "The young people think only of their love. Whether they are suited to each other will be seen only when they live together. If one of them is not suited to the other, they separate and each of them looks for another partner!" This is no proof against the basic lifelong continuance of marriage, but the fact of divorce is not only recognized, but, under certain

/738 cont. /

864 been pushed out of place, but never add any particular warning. Unobtrusively the mother draws her small daughter closer in the hut and takes her darling silently by the hand when she goes to gather mussels or wood; the boys then automatically remain apart and stay behind. Thus the children unconsciously take it for granted that boys and girls are separated, and in neither of the two groups is the wish to be together and to play together awakened unnecessarily and prematurely.

It does not long remain hidden from either of them how distinctly different they are externally, for the so-called clothing is scant enough. It is not until their seventh year that the children must expect short and definite warnings if boys conspicuously approach girls. Even forward boys seem to avoid any comments among themselves on sexual differences. Alfredo confessed to me: "Every boy at some time or other realizes that he is [built] different [sexually] from the girl. Now he watches very sharply, but does not talk about it with anyone, although he sometimes feels lustful pleasure [in his discovery]." These words indicate the awakening of knowledge about the body.

593 Since during most of the year the individual family is dependent on its own resources, the brothers and sisters have only each other and no other company. Thus it is strange that a brotherly and sisterly love in our sense of the word does not appear among the Fuegians, any more than it does among the neighboring Selk'nam (Vol. I, 393). Since the children of the same parents associate only with one another for long stretches, one would expect a particularly strong and intensified mutual love; instead he finds just the opposite. A very strong tendency toward self-reliance and independence characterizes the child from its earliest years. This one must admit. This alone, however, does not explain why a strong feeling of solidarity among the children of the same family does not seem to arise at all. They rarely play together, nor do they confer about carrying out some prank together or making mischief. Each of the brothers and sisters actually feels best when he is by himself and can entertain himself just as he pleases. One can plainly see how each one of them entertains himself animatedly and how happily he gets along by himself. /739/ Should one of his brothers or sisters approach him, it would disturb his quiet

/739 cont. /

●593 self-sufficiency. Actually, each one goes his own way, completely unconcerned about the others. It makes no difference to him how his brothers and sisters get along and what they do.

[855] Older girls, however, at their mother's request, must tend the youngest of their brothers and sisters occasionally. They do so, but more because they are forced to than because of a natural urge, and they are relieved when this minor duty is over. Beyond that one almost never sees brothers and sisters of their own accord helping or supporting each other. They are, so to speak, indifferent toward one another; in fact, they even go out of their way in order to be quite undisturbed. Hence it follows that they almost never quarrel or fight with one another. A child would never voluntarily help a brother or small sister at work or join them in some chore imposed by the parents. If two children are given the same job, they do not, for example, agree to do it together, but each one strikes out for himself toward the same goal. Thus two girls going to hunt berries and two boys out to gather dry sticks go off separately and in different directions. On their return they do not meet on the same path until shortly before they reach the hut.

[513] One never hears parents reminding children that they must love their brothers and sisters. If occasionally adult brothers and sisters stand up for each other and defend one another it is out of a feeling of family solidarity. The mother carefully arranges the sleeping place of her boys separately from that of the girls in the small family hut (179). In the canoe they are

179. Hyades (f):573 says emphatically:
"During the night the boys and the girls
form separate groups according to sex"
/translated from French/. A separate
allotment of space in the hut for each
child is unknown to the Yamana (p. 26).

separated on either side of the fire. Altogether, brothers and sisters are separated more than many Europeans realize, but even so they forgo any co-operation in work or play.

/773 cont./

857 games spontaneously and need not be told to do so by the adults. If the latter take part in them, they have a stimulating effect on the young people.

5. Mutual Relationship of Parents and Children

593 Anyone who only superficially observes the Yamana will probably be aware of the loving affection and solicitous care that every pair of parents bestows on their infant, whereas mature children seem to be a little aloof from their parents. This is an illusion. There is something in it, however, since young people show great respect for all adults, especially their own parents. We can probably say that the little Fuegians are born with this charming virtue, and if it should be deficient or lacking, it is taught and fostered by the child's teachers. The latter, as we know (p. 514), keep their expressions of love within narrow limits and in everyday life never smother a grown child with affection. Not that the Yamana have no feeling for him -- they outdo themselves in loving service for a sick child -- but because they are much too reasonable and sensible to expend themselves in too many externals, for this would gradually make the child indifferent. A love that is genuine and willing to make sacrifices does live in the hearts of the parents, however, and expresses itself in their efforts for the child's spiritual and physical welfare. This is for them a matter of duty, to which they devote themselves in all seriousness. The child knows this and experiences it often. Hence he cannot be otherwise than respectful toward his parents who are far superior to him in maturity of judgment, general experience, and knowledge of tribal customs.

Due to this conviction and his inner restraint, the child is submissive and docile; he gives unqualified obedience and shows that he is very willing. Those children know nothing about grumbling at orders and pulling a long face at disagreeable errands. Defiant stubbornness and loud contradictions are unheard-of in Tierra del Fuego. Every child knows that he must submit to the orders of adults, and children do this even after they are married (203).

203. Hyades (p):332 said several times that

/773 cont./

• 593

"as a general rule, adults always respect their parents, the father a little more than the mother" /translated from French/.

The respectful attitude of Fuegian children toward their parents does not in the least affect the loving fellowship of parents and children together. They are naturally dependent on one another, and the more they are in harmony, the more surely will the /774/ family, as a self-contained social entity, fulfill its duty toward the tribe and the more easily it will attain its goal as an economic unit. The children complement their parents spiritually, and vice versa. They cling to each other and instinctively as well as consciously avoid anything that might separate them. They live for each other's happiness.

[52]

Although embracing and kissing are not customary among them, they show their affection toward one another with friendly looks and heartfelt words, by caressing and leaning against one another, with affectionate play and all kinds of attentions. Parents are concerned day and night about their little ones; they provide food and shelter, maintenance and security; indeed, they risk their own lives and defy all kinds of danger to promote the health and welfare of their child (204). How dear and precious a child is

204. Like Lovisato (b):145 (see footnote 208), Bove (e):158 and (g):234 also makes the absurd assertion: "Mother love lasts about as long as the child nurses at the breast; by the age of seven or eight the parents' influence soon ceases altogether, for as soon as the son is able to get along without his parents, he leaves them. The only feeling that governs them is self-love." Hyades (p):331 describes the true situation, although much too tersely: "In general the parents care for their children until the day the latter marry" /translated from French/.

to its parents is unequivocally expressed when the child is severely ill or lost through death.

/774 cont. /

593
861 Since they are sincere, they take pains as teachers so that the child's happiness in life is assured. They can even be severe and relentless, not because they enjoy tormenting him, but because weaknesses of character that appear in early years must be removed as soon as possible (205). Parental training is oriented

205. Hyades (g):38 specifically mentions:
"Girls and boys, by the way, are very well treated, even though their parents do not act as tenderly with them as parents do in Europe."

by the traditions of the tribe as to what is good and necessary. Accordingly, the Fuegian principles of child training are altogether moral.

Our natives know very well that with youth the example is more effective than the word and, conversely, that the former can cause much greater harm than can be remedied by the latter. Hence adults consciously conduct themselves as irreproachably as possible in the presence of children. The older people, especially, in contrast to men and women of younger years, are sometimes painfully exact about this. They rigidly control themselves and display astonishing self-discipline in order that their conduct will not weaken the warning and instructive words that they addressed to the young people in their day; successful training presupposes self-training.

867 I often observed that children were sent from the hut under a harmless pretext whenever the men were getting ready to tell risqué stories. On such an occasion, after the last boy had disappeared from the hut, old Alfredo whispered in my ear: /775/
"The children must not know that we enjoy smutty stories, otherwise they would like hearing them just as much as we do!" One evening red wine, sápa, was freely dispensed and had such a powerful effect on an older woman that in her tipsiness she began to behave improperly. Immediately the adults removed all the children, and while this was going on Mary said to me: "If the children saw how that woman behaves, they would become bad. That is why we send them away!" Children probably never hear crude

/775 cont./

867 jokes and obscenities from adults. The latter may reveal weaknesses during moments when they lose control of themselves, but in general they try to appear exemplary and without faults in [833] front of youngsters. Parents are extremely careful in their conjugal relations, since the little ones sleep in the same hut.

583 Because parents honestly strive not to show their weaknesses before young people and to be truly at their best for their own child, the children see them in a pure light. This brings about the tender and deeply felt attachment of children toward those to whom they owe so much. Fortunately, this is also promoted by daily contact, which convincingly demonstrates how very much the members of an individual family are dependent upon one another. The consciousness of belonging together becomes so intense that individuals do not like to be separated even temporarily. Hence, it is impossible for some families to get a child from among their circle of relatives to stay with them in their hut for a few days, which is greatly desired by a family that for some reason or other does not have a little child.

591 At present there are a few families without children, and 152 they are making an effort to take some child in with them for a short time (206). In spite of all the love and care that they offer,

206. Bridges (a):183 hints at this custom:
"Children do not always live with their parents, sometimes a friend takes them away and they are away from their parents for weeks" /cited in English/.

the little ones scarcely ever feel quite at home with them and soon beg to be taken back to the parental hut. Children simply cannot stand to be with other people permanently (207). We can

207. Bridges (a):184 once maintained: "A girl before she is finally given away to her destined husband is now and again sent to live with him for a short time, when she again returns to her parents; but no sooner is she of marriageable age than she is finally disposed of" /cited in English/. Such a

/775 cont./

591
652 practice was not customary among the
Yamana according to my inquiries.

easily imagine how the poor creatures who are orphaned suffer for years. Some relative, to be sure, takes charge of them and tries his best to care for them, but he cannot replace their real parents.

593
152
574 Even after children have long since established their own households, they often visit their old parents (208) out of a childish

208. In the following words, which are incomprehensible to me, Lovisato (b):145 proves that he lacks a gift for observation: "Among the Fuegians... maternal love does not exist. The love of a mother for her child lasts only as long as he is nursing; when he leaves the breast, it diminishes, and by the time he is seven or eight years old it ceases completely... Also, the children have little love for their parents" /translated from Italian/.

desire for love; they are happy when they can see them and inquire about their circumstances. /776/ When they meet other people, they try to learn something about their own parents. The latter, too, follow their child no less with their thoughts and hopes when, as sometimes happens, they do not see him for months. They are happy when they hear good and pleasant news; unfavorable and derogatory reports make them sad. It is well known that during the first several weeks, the new bride often goes back to her mother, and the mother, overjoyed, says to her: "I want to paint you!" She does this with particular tenderness and in the hope that the young husband will learn to love her daughter very much (p.428). Afterwards the daughter presents herself to her husband and says: "My mother painted me!" This is intended to remind him of the wedding and to arouse his initial love. The frequent visits, however, are above all an expression of the firm attachment of the child to the parents, which even marriage does not loosen.

/776 cont./

861

The characteristic quality of the relationship between parents and children in Tierra del Fuego is sincere love and warm affection. The children display respect and confidence. In their training procedures nothing diverts the parents from what they regard as duty and necessity. I often and carefully observed them in this respect. I was most struck by how well they are able to control themselves and how much patience they have with their children, along with all the firmness. Fuegian teachers have an almost inexhaustible forbearance, and they never tire of pointing out mistakes to their small offspring or often repeating urgent advice. Santiago, who was inclined to be somewhat irascible, quietly and emphatically talked to a regular rascal for about ten minutes and dismissed him with the words: "I have often warned you, and I shall not stop doing so until you stop being naughty!" Then he added confidentially to me: "Children will be children; it takes a long time to get anywhere with them by talking, but one succeeds if he does not give up and is always well-meaning." Adults instantly react to obvious faults and occasional infractions; they even give whippings, but this seldom happens.

593

Parents and children, naturally bound together most closely and almost exclusively dependent on one another because of the nature of their economy, are held together by the bonds of sincere love and warm affection. Their happiness in life is in being together and caring for one another. Outside, the storm may be howling and shaking the frail hut, living conditions may be as poor as can be, and for long weeks there may be no other companions, but if the parents and children are all together, they are happy. In the bosom of his own family everyone feels protected and safe; the family guarantees the well-being of the individual. If one sees parents and children together, he can see shining from their /777/ eyes the trust that flourishes in the soil of a family arrangement destined by nature. Parental happiness and childhood paradise in the Indian family thrown back on its own resources: these are the brightest spots in the threatening climatic turbulence and the frosty unfriendliness of Tierra del Fuego.

/780 cont./

591

orphan, on the other hand, remains joined to the surviving parent until it establishes its own household through marriage, but until then, besides his own parent, the new stepfather or stepmother must take charge of him /781/ as though he were his own child. All this shows the individual family to be a small state by itself, whose boundaries literally coincide with the narrow plot of the family hut, Ēkēr (214).

214. Bridges refers to this with a somewhat unfortunate way of expressing himself: "The term 'Ucum', which primarily means a dwelling of any kind, secondarily family, kinsfolk, is the term used to denote clan or tribe" /cited in English/ (MM:XVIII, 234; 1884). Hyades ():718 repeats this sentence.

593

The proximity of the members of an individual family unavoidably forces upon them a consciousness of their mutual obligations. Nature herself imposes them on parents, and the attitude of the children toward those who gave them life is thus also imposed. Hence they must be ready to help obediently and submissively, if they are old enough, and to contribute to the stability and growth of the family as a whole. All members derive their particular benefits from the family community, but the latter can exist and live up to what everyone expects of it only if the individual serves it according to his ability and the prevailing division of labor. On such soil a strong, loyal family feeling flourishes. Each of the two parents lives and works for the family; their own wishes, which they might sometimes like to express, recede far behind its demands; their personalities unfold in the service of the other members of the family.

Hyades (f):586 observed this pronounced family feeling: "The feeling for the family is highly developed among these savages; it has been rightly said that it was the strongest tie that kept them united" /translated from French/. Elsewhere Hyades (g):36 emphasizes that despite separation "a certain connection always remains and the offspring of a family always feel that they belong together in case of danger and strife." Finally, Bridges

/781 cont. /

593 (a):204, from another point of view, also elucidates that relationship: "Family influence is the one great tie which binds these natives together, and the one great preventive of violence" /cited in English/.

The son or daughter or the older brother or older sister who marries may not renounce his duties toward his own parents and his still small brothers and sisters. It is true that he severs his close connection with the parental hut, but not his intimate relationship with the persons it shelters. For the rest of their lives the children remain in touch with their parents and their brothers and sisters (215). For each one his own family, as well as every

215. Spegazzini (a):166 emphasizes "family affection," but this love, far from "not manifesting itself much in familial relationships, in which a barbaric egoism seems to prevail" /translated from Spanish/, enfolds its most beautiful blossoms on this very soil. In the face of all this, Bove (g):234 makes the monstrous assertion that "there are no family ties" /translated from Italian/.

member of it, is incomparably dear and esteemed; everyone gives the family the highest praise and remembers the truly good things it stands for with utmost appreciation. Anyone speaking of the accomplishments /782/ or personal advantages of the members of his family praises them in terms which can hardly be surpassed. Universally binding regulations prevent the dangers of one-sided exaggeration, rude selfishness, or voluntary withdrawal from the group. The individual family per se is and remains firmly fixed (216); other individual families and its considerable

216. Hyades Op):333 confirms this with the following words: "The family is well established, but the tribe does not exist, properly speaking" /translated from French/.

independence even of the society as a whole (217).

217. Now and then an observer realized,

/782 cont./

593

along with Bove (g):244, that "every Fuegian family lives in the utmost independence" /translated from Italian/. This independence, however, is never so great, as is maintained in Outes (g):58, "that the father cannot threaten his child nor give him direct orders" /translated from Spanish/.

A second prominent feature of the Fuegian family is its patriarchal tendency. The latter is clearly recognizable, although by only a few indications; yet there is neither a law of inheritance nor clan formations with special demands and obligations. Nevertheless, the father is and remains the head of the whole family, even though, through the division of labor, his wife has an independent field of activity, and he therefore rarely asserts his slightly superior power. Martial:196 describes this lawful relationship as follows: "Authority in the family belongs to the father; wife and children obey him. His authority, however, is very weak and is exercised only in case of necessity" /translated from French/. Each of the two partners can freely dispose of his or her special property. Nevertheless, the care and responsibility for common possessions or for family property fall on the man. He gives the ultimate decision on matters of some importance for the family members, and all of them yield to his words. If he dies, his older brother must take charge of the wife and children he leaves behind, and this is a universally lawful obligation. "This patriarchal tendency in Fuegian family organization is not expressed in name-giving, but since here the name is taken from the place of birth (p. 536), there is no real connection.

[421]

2. The Circle of Relatives

612

In the tribal society of our Yamana every individual family is an independent, self-contained structure. In contrast to this, relatives are a loose aggregate of all those who are joined by the ties of comanguinity. According to Fuegian ideas, persons are related to each other only if they can trace their origins to some

[1903 cont.]

422 this method of procedure by our Yamana on two occasions. Once he bartered tobacco with a man for a dog, but since the dog belonged to the man's wife, she forced Fitz-Roy to give the animal back to her. Snow (p. 264) also confirms from his own experience: "I believe they have a sort of property right amongst them, and I have seen one of the oldest women exercising authority over the rest of her people. Wishing to buy a canoe, it was refused me on the ground that it belonged to her, and she would not part with it" /cited in English/.

Every Yamana is completely free to take good care of his property or to neglect it completely. No one even prevents him from wantonly destroying his things. If he lacks something he must personally look around for a replacement. Objects that are found may not be appropriated by the finder, and if he nevertheless keeps them, he risks being labeled a thief. Whatever a person has owned in life /1976/ remains his after his death. That is why the belongings of a deceased person are burned and destroyed, inasmuch as no one could legally take them as his property. One does not even encroach upon a dead owner's right to his personal property. The Yamana are unacquainted with the actual inheritance of anything whatever.

B. Family Property

422 Since every person owns his individual property, he also
 593 brings it with him into his marriage, without, however, giving up his exclusive right to it. He uses each article freely and without hindrance and replaces for himself anything and everything that has become unserviceable or is lost. As we have just said, one of the partners in marriage would not dare, at his own discretion, to dispose of an object belonging to the other partner.

423 When a marriage takes place, a new configuration of life is
 593 always begun, for the family forms a very compact economic unit. The word "family" is used here in its narrower sense, namely, as the social unit of father, mother, and unmarried children. The new configuration of life also demands its own right to certain implements common to the union as such. The solidarity of family

/970 cont./

423 members is visibly symbolized by the hut in which they all find
513 shelter. The man and woman are simultaneously active in its
construction, although he is obliged to do the heavier work and
she the much easier light work. The children work, too, no
matter how slight their participation is. In like manner, both
spouses equally keep the hut in repair after it has been built. It
is primarily the woman's duty to perform minor repairs. The skins
needed to cover the hut framework are furnished by the man from
hunting, while the woman dresses the skins. She stores and trans-
ports these pieces of leather in her canoe. No other articles are
required as common property for the construction of the hut.
Naturally, everyone, without discrimination, enjoys the benefit
of the fire, since all the members of the family, in one way or
another, see that it does not go out.

423 If, in an exceptional case, two or three families should erect
512 a common dwelling (p. 32), they readily agree on the division of
space, within which each one does as he pleases. If one family
wanders off sooner than another, they take down their pieces of
leather from the framework and load their own things into their
canoe. The family that stays behind then closes off the space that
they still want to occupy.

423 Only the husband or the wife has the right to permit this guest
514 or that visitor to enter their hut. It is generally regarded as an en-
croachment to enter a hut without permission, although this is usu-
ally tacitly assumed. Once the family has given up their camp-
site /971/ and departed with their implements, the hut framework
left behind is regarded as ownerless. Whoever first takes possession
of it lawfully owns it and may reside in it undisturbed.

423 In a certain sense the various foods are also doubtless re-
513 garded as common property of the family, the idea being that the
husband and the wife are obliged to seek food for themselves and
the members of their family. The Forgiams' conviction concern-
ing this obligation comes out most clearly when an indolent, lazy
64 man neglects his hunting and lets his family starve. The whole
neighborhood expresses its displeasure, and the society even grants
the wife the right to leave such a neglectful husband. The man
collects meat for the whole family, and the woman gathers
smaller animals for all her loved ones, indiscriminately, for

/971 cont./

everyone has his own right to whatever serves for the support and maintenance of family members and he may be deprived of nothing. Thus the husband or wife does not work for himself alone in obtaining food.

The little supplementary word "se" clearly emphasizes the urgent concern for all the members of the family to hunt and gather simultaneously and without exception. BD-379 states: "se [s] used by one person to another in giving any orders or expressing their desires and conveys a sense of mutual interest and ownership, or rather right to the results of what is done or obtained. se ekili manja jan, go and get us some fuel, for the common good. se disajin epuf (a man to his wife) come, get us some mussels" /cited in English/.

Every occupant has access to everything in the dwelling in the way of foodstuffs, although in many cases the wife and mother put the roast or the mussels on the fire in response to the wish of the husband or children. Guests and visitors, however, wait for a special invitation before reaching out for food, and this difference in behavior should be clearly emphasized.

Among themselves the Yamana are pledged to mutual aid; hence everyone generously shares with his neighbors the things he brings home. This does not alter the fact that sometimes a family saves larger pieces and more delectable bits for its members. Even during the distribution of booty among others the joint procedure of the two spouses is in evidence. While the man cuts up a sea lion, for example, the wife will decide on some piece for this or that family, at the same time anticipating their tacit agreement. To show favoritism toward dear relatives and intimate acquaintances is, after all, a common human trait from which our Fuegians, too, are not exempt. If the husband or the wife is for any reason prevented from hunting for food, it is the duty of the other partner to be twice as active to provide enough so that no member of the family suffers harm. If a neighbor must be supported because he is ill or /978/ has lost his weapons, the woman takes him more food than is customary, but only after discussing it with her husband, inasmuch as she feels that she alone is not entitled to dispose of what the man brought to the family but from his hunting or she herself from her gathering, which should serve the whole family.

/972 cont. /

431 Nevertheless this does not entirely deny a person a certain prerogative over whatever he has brought in, and a completely equal right to it in the communistic sense is never granted to the members of the family (385).
476
593

385. This opinion is clearly expressed in BD:319 in the explanation of the verb "mōtabaku: To take or make use of what is not one's own but yet is proper to take or use, as for instance a husband his wife's fish, or a brother, if hungry, fish belonging to a brother or sister during their absence, though when he saw them he would tell them what he had done" /cited in English/.

422 For the individual family, the vessel, whether it be a bark
593 canoe or a flat skiff, is no less important than dwelling and food. Although it is made by the man, it is the woman's duty to service it, guard it, and care for it (p. 134). During the trip through the channels she has authority in the canoe, because she alone usually rows or paddles. Also, after landing and before departure it is only her concern. Since, however, the canoe serves all the members of the family without exception and since neither the individual nor the family as a whole can do without it, all separate rights or privileges cease, although the husband built the canoe and the wife mans it.

Hence we must regard the few things that rightfully belong to the self-contained family and each member of this familial unit as actual "family property." As such, this includes only the dwelling, the canoe, and food, and toward these an individual person cannot claim any special rights and privileges. Obviously this legal situation strengthens family ties and increases the feeling of responsibility of one toward the other with whom he is intimately associated in the life of the individual family.

/974 cont./

2. Taking Possession

425 The most common and the simplest way of making oneself the owner of an object is to take it and confiscate it. The assumption is that, as ownerless property, it really does not belong to anyone. This includes, first of all, the things that are indispensable for life, such as food, wood for the fire, and sticks for building the hut, as well as such things as bones and whalebone for tools, pieces of bark for the canoe, and rushes for basket-weaving, and finally snail shells and tendons for ornaments, mineral pigments for body painting, and pieces of leather for various uses. Obviously all these things come from the kingdom of nature over which Wataññiwa actually has the primary right of disposal. The Yamana have a more or less distinctly pronounced conviction that everything around them has been granted by Wataññiwa so that they may have the usufruct of it. They make use of this general dispensation, for in no other way would they come into possession of the things they need. They do not each time expressly remember this lawful condition, but now and then the commandment not to kill more animals than are directly required for the household flairs up in their memory.

Merely by his conduct a person shows that he intends to make himself the owner of an animal or a thing. Anyone who goes into the forest and gathers firewood, anyone gathering mussels and snails along the beach, anyone who kills a larger animal with his weapons or acquires something in a similar manner thereafter regards himself as sole owner of what he has acquired. At the same time his right is recognized by other people. If, after a certain object has found its master, anyone should disturb the latter in his right of ownership, that person is unequivocally regarded as a thief. Thus it is sufficient for anyone simply to lay his hands on ownerless goods, for in this way he identifies himself as their owner. He remains such as long as he keeps these goods or until he has consumed them. Even married persons take this into account in their behavior toward each other, as /975/ Bridges (i):21 has already assured us: "What the wife caught or obtained was her own, the husband only used of it what his wife gave him, and she did not ask his permission

[673]

425
● 543

425
[593] /975 cont. /

when she would make presents to her friends" /cited in English/ (387).

387. Hyades (q):243 writes in a similar vein:
"Each properly possesses what he has produced by his labor, what he has harvested in fishing or hunting, what he has found washed up on the beach; even small children themselves have full ownership of what has been given them"
/translated from French/.

Sometimes the new owner does not immediately use what has hitherto been ownerless property. In a given case he will make known his right to it by special signs, if it is not obvious from the surrounding circumstances. For example, if someone comes across large pieces of a recently killed sea lion stored in tree branches, he immediately concludes that the successful hunter did not want to or was unable to take along the whole booty and left part of it behind which he will pick up soon. It is not permissible for another person to take possession of those pieces of meat. We know that the Yamana collect branches and trunks for firewood, place them upright against each other in the woods, and let them dry out for a few days. A person passing this bundle of wood immediately recognizes the work performed by another and does not take any of it. If someone finds a sling fastened in the grass (Fig. 59) in which possibly a few wild geese are caught, it would never occur to him to appropriate either of them, and he leaves undisturbed the claim of the one who laid the snare. The surrounding circumstances alone, therefore, make it clear whether goods are ownerless or whether someone has already made himself master of them. The Yamana do not use special property marks since these are for the most part superfluous or would be difficult to apply.

In general the Yamana derive the legal title for the assumption of ownership from the work and effort involved. The ensuing right of possession is recompense for the previous work. Therefore, anyone who of his own accord and with his own labor has accomplished this work enjoys possession of the goods earned. Naturally, in each case only the amount affected by individual effort passes from the ownerless state into that of personal possession.

/1471 cont./

1. Gatherings

571 From previous accounts the Yamana is known to be a person
 593 who has himself under perfect control and who usually behaves in
 521 a very /1472/ reserved manner in the company of others (p. 914).
 This attitude is not determined solely by mistrust of others and the
 traditional rules for social intercourse (p. 913); it is far more a
 natural characteristic of our Indians, to which their training, of
 course, contributes its share. Within the family circle every
 member is very reserved and taciturn. For hours at a time individuals
 will sit beside each other in the canoe or in the hut without ex-
 changing a word. If they chat with one another now and then,
 their talk almost always centers around what the present day has
 brought. Loud gaiety and spontaneous outbursts of joy are more or
 less rare within the individual family. Nevertheless, many a
 father will amuse himself with his young sons and many an active
 mother will do the same with her daughters in every conceivable
 way. Parents really enjoy playing with their young children and
 fondle them very lovingly from the day they are born (p. 513).

593 As soon as children have some understanding, the parents confide
 961 in them about their own experiences and the knowledge derived
 521 from it, as well as much of their religious and mythological be-
 lief. In this way the children obtain a rich heritage of ideas and
 learn to think about it when they are alone. In the evening after
 the long day's journey, the parents, squatting around the hut fire
 or stretched out on their hard beds, repeat in detail just about
 everything that the day has brought. They make comparisons and
 recall other things, confirm this thing and warn about that, discuss
 their plans for the morrow, and toy with hopes for the future. This
 is the particular kind of social life, maintained within narrow (in
 fact, the narrowest) limits, that the Fuegian family can offer them.

571 On a land or canoe trip individual persons usually pass each
 521 other without stopping; both parties are content with a brief greet-
 ing, a modest question and an equally brief answer (p. 921). If,
 however, several families of friends or relatives brought together
 by chance after a long separation are camping together, there is
 great liveliness in the group. The greeting of two friends is some-
 times loud and impulsive, and on such an occasion the discussion

591 after which they would usually go for good to the groom's kin. Thus, localized groups of kin tended to be paternal.

604 After marriage the husband's paternal uncle and the wife's maternal aunt took particular interest in them, superseding in large measure their respective parents. Children-in-law were expected to look after their parents-in-law in sickness or other needs. Children-in-law observed a number of avoidances regarding their parents-in-law: greeting their parents-in-law, speaking to them or breaking in on their conversation with remarks, looking at them, and sitting down beside them were all taboo. When in the same hut with their parents-in-law, they turned their sides or backs on them. A year or so after marriage, the restrictions between daughter-in-law and mother-in-law were partly, but never wholly, relaxed; those between son-in-law and father-in-law lasted through life. On visits of the father-in-law to his daughter, he and his son-in-law communicated wishes and news through the daughter and wife or by indirect discourse.

562 The man was, in theory, considered the head of the family, with authority to rule. Actually, his authority was very far from absolute, and the woman was largely her own mistress, particularly in such provinces of her own as child rearing, food gathering, and canoe managing. Some men domineered over their wives, but not a few husbands were under the thumbs of their spouses. Some husbands were cruel, but if so they ran afoul of the wife's kin. More generally, woman's position both in the family and in the community seemed a respected one, not that of a drudge, slave, or inferior being, and she enjoyed a fairly high degree of freedom and independence.

684 Adultery was disapproved by the Yahgan code, but apparently 831 the code suffered appreciable infringement in practice. Adultery on the wife's part was, if discovered, punished by the husband with sound beatings, very rarely with death. Public opinion disapproved of her behavior. Adultery on the husband's part also gave rise to domestic battles in which the husband sometimes suffered severe treatment at his offended wife's hands. Jealousy on the part of both husband and wife was common. Wife lending was absent. There was no professional prostitution; a woman, married or unmarried, of markedly loose character was looked down upon.

586 Separation and divorce were fairly frequent, but were not lightly resorted to. The most common cause appears to have been cruel treatment of the wife by the husband, though there were other causes such as marked laziness, negligence, or crabbedness on the part of the wife. In case the wife became incapacitated through illness or age, the man could, and, it seems, more commonly did, take to himself a Second Wife.